On an extremal problem of Garcia and Ross

I. Chalendar[*], E. Fricain[†] and D. Timotin[‡]

Abstract

We show the equivalence of two extremal problems on Hardy spaces, thus answering a question posed by Garcia and Ross. The proof uses a slight generalization of complex symmetric operators.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2000): Primary 47A05, 47B35; Secondary 47B99.
Key words and phrases: Extremal problem, Hankel operator, complex symmetric operator.

1 Introduction

In [4] Garcia and Ross discuss a nonlinear extremal problem for functions in the Hardy space and its relation to a well studied linear extremal problem. Specifically, let $\mathbb{D} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| < 1\}$ be the unit disc in the complex plane and $\mathbb{T} = \{z \in \mathbb{C} : |z| = 1\}$ the unit circle. For $p > 0$, let H^p denote the classical Hardy space on $\mathbb{D}$ (identified, as usual, with a closed subspace of $L^p = L^p(\mathbb{T})$). For fixed $\psi \in L^\infty$, the following nonlinear extremal problem is considered in [4]:

$$\Gamma(\psi) := \sup_{\substack{f\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=1}} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \psi(z) f(z)^2 \, dz \right|. \tag{1}$$

This is closely related to the well known classical linear extremal problem

$$\Lambda(\psi) := \sup_{\substack{F\in H^1\\ \|F\|_1=1}} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{T}} \psi(z) F(z) \, dz \right|; \tag{2}$$

[*]Université de Lyon; Université Lyon 1; INSA de Lyon; Ecole Centrale de Lyon; CNRS, UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan; 43 bld. du 11 novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France. chalenda@math.univ-lyon1.fr.

[†]Université de Lyon; Université Lyon 1; INSA de Lyon; Ecole Centrale de Lyon; CNRS, UMR 5208, Institut Camille Jordan; 43 bld. du 11 novembre 1918, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France. fricain@math.univ-lyon1.fr

[‡]Institute of Mathematics of the Romanian Academy, PO Box 1-764, Bucharest 014700, Romania. Dan.Timotin@imar.ro

it is noted in [4] that we always have $\Gamma(\psi) \le \Lambda(\psi)$, and it is proved that in some particular cases, including the case of rational ψ, we have equality. We show in this short note that equality actually holds for all $\psi \in L^\infty$, thus answering an open question stated in [4].

The two problems can be reformulated in terms of operators on a Hilbert space. Denote by P_+ the projection in L^2 onto H^2 and by P_- the projection onto $H^2_- := L^2 \ominus H^2$. The Hankel operator of symbol ψ is $\mathfrak{H}_\psi : H^2 \to H^2_-$, defined by $\mathfrak{H}_\psi f = P_- \psi f$.

By changing the variable $z = e^{it}$ and denoting $\zeta(t) = e^{it}$, we have

$$\Gamma(\psi) = \sup_{\substack{f\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=1}} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \zeta(t)\psi(e^{it}) f(e^{it})^2 \, dt \right| = \sup_{\substack{f\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=1}} |\langle \psi f, \bar\zeta \bar f\rangle| = \sup_{\substack{f\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=1}} |\langle \mathfrak{H}_\psi f, \bar\zeta \bar f\rangle|. \quad (3)$$

On the other hand, any function $F \in H^1$ may be written as $F = fg$ with $f, g \in H^2$ and $\|f\|_2 = \|g\|_2 = \|F\|_1$. Therefore we get

$$\Lambda(\psi) = \sup_{\substack{f,g\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=\|g\|_2=1}} \left| \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \zeta(t)\psi(e^{it}) f(e^{it}) g(e^{it}) \, dt \right| = \sup_{\substack{f,g\in H^2\\ \|f\|_2=\|g\|_2=1}} |\langle \psi f, \bar\zeta \bar g\rangle| = \|\mathfrak{H}_\psi\|. \quad (4)$$

Both problems (1) and (2) are thus rephrased in terms of Hankel operators. A convenient reference for these, including all results that we shall use below, is [9].

2 Complex symmetric operators and their relatives

In [2, 3] the authors introduce the notion of *complex symmetric* operator on a Hilbert space, which has since found several applications; in particular, complex symmetric operators are used in [4] to prove the equivalence, in a particular case, of the two extremal problems. We need an extension of some of these facts to operators acting between two different spaces.

Suppose then that $\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$ are two Hilbert spaces. Define $\mathfrak{c} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ to be an *antiunitary* operator if it is a conjugate linear surjective map which satisfies $\langle \mathfrak{c}x, \mathfrak{c}x' \rangle = \langle x', x\rangle$ for all $x, x' \in \mathcal{X}$. It is then immediate that $\mathfrak{c}^{-1} : \mathcal{Y} \to \mathcal{X}$ is also an antiunitary operator. A *conjugation* is an antiunitary operator which acts on the same space and is equal to its inverse. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, we say that T is $\mathfrak{c}$-*symmetric* if $T = \mathfrak{c}T^*\mathfrak{c}$. If $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X})$ and there exists a conjugation C such that T is C-symmetric, then one says that T is *complex symmetric*; this is the class considered in [2, 3].

In order to go from complex symmetric to $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric operators, the main tool is the following lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *If $\mathfrak{c} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is an antiunitary operator, then there exists a unitary operator $V : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ (not uniquely defined) such that $C = V^*\mathfrak{c}$ is a conjugation on $\mathcal{X}$. If such a V is* *fixed, then the map $T \mapsto V^*T$ is a bijection between $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric operators and C-symmetric operators.*

Proof. Take an orthonormal basis (e_n) in $\mathcal{X}$, and define V to be the unitary operator which maps e_n into $\mathfrak{c}e_n$. Then it is easily seen that $C = V^*\mathfrak{c}$ is precisely the conjugation on $\mathcal{X}$ associated with the basis (e_n).

Now, if $T \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} T = \mathfrak{c}T^*\mathfrak{c} \quad &\Leftrightarrow \quad V^*T = V^*\mathfrak{c}T^*\mathfrak{c} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad V^*T = V^*\mathfrak{c}T^*VV^*\mathfrak{c} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \quad V^*T = C(V^*T)^*C, \end{aligned}$$

which proves the second part of the lemma. □

As a consequence, we obtain the result that interests us, namely the analogue of Theorem 1 in [4] (which deals with the complex symmetric case).

Lemma 2.2. *Suppose $\mathfrak{c} : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is an antiunitary operator and $T : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{Y}$ is $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric. Then:*

(i) $\|T\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle Tx, \mathfrak{c}x\rangle|$.

(ii) The supremum in (i) is attained if and only if T attains its norm (or, equivalently, if $\|T\|$ is an eigenvalue for $|T|$.) In this case $Tx = \omega\|T\|\mathfrak{c}x$ for some unimodular constant ω.

Proof. Suppose that V is the unitary operator and C is the conjugation given by Lemma 2.1; thus $T' := V^*T$ is C-symmetric. Theorem 1 in [4] says then that $\|T'\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle T'x, Cx\rangle|$. Since $\|T\| = \|T'\|$ and

$$\sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle Tx, \mathfrak{c}x\rangle| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle V^*Tx, V^*\mathfrak{c}x\rangle| = \sup_{\|x\|=1} |\langle T'x, Cx\rangle|,$$

the first assertion is proved.

For the second, it is immediate by Schwarz's inequality that, if $\|x\| = 1$, then $\|T\| = |\langle Tx, \mathfrak{c}x\rangle|$ if and only if $Tx = \omega\|T\|\mathfrak{c}x$ for some unimodular constant ω. But it is a general fact (for any operator T) that T attains its norm if and only if $\|T\|$ is an eigenvalue of $|T|$, given that $\|T\| = \||T|\|$ and $\||T|\| = \sup_{\|x\|=1}\langle |T|x, x\rangle$. □

It might be of independent interest to state, as a corollary, the corresponding version of Theorem 2 in [1], characterizing the spectrum of the modulus of a $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric operator in terms of what Garcia [1] calls an approximate antilinear eigenvalue problem.

Proposition 2.3. Let T be a bounded $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric operator and $\lambda \geq 0$. Then

(i) λ belongs to the spectrum of $|T|$ if and only if there exists a sequence of unit vectors $(f_n)_n$ such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} \|(T - \lambda\mathfrak{c})f_n\| = 0$.

(ii) λ is a singular value of T if and only if $Tf = \lambda\mathfrak{c}f$ has a nonzero solution f.

3 Main result

We can now prove the equivalence of the two problems (1) and (2) in the general case.

Theorem 3.1. *For any $\psi \in L^\infty$ we have $\Gamma(\psi) = \Lambda(\psi)$.*

Proof. We intend to apply Lemma 2.2 to the following situation: $\mathcal{X} = H^2$, $\mathcal{Y} = H^2_-$, $T = \mathfrak{H}_\psi$ and $\mathfrak{c} : H^2 \to H^2_-$ defined by $\mathfrak{c}f = \bar{\zeta}\bar{f}$. It is easy to see that $\mathfrak{c}$ is antiunitary. Note that $\mathfrak{c}^{-1} : H^2_- \to H^2$ is given formally by the same formula as $\mathfrak{c}$. To be more accurate, we will define $\mathfrak{C} : L^2 \to L^2$ by $\mathfrak{C}f = \bar{\zeta}\bar{f}$. Then $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{C}|H^2 = P_-\mathfrak{C}|H^2$ and $\mathfrak{c}^{-1} = \mathfrak{C}|H^2_- = P_+\mathfrak{C}|H^2_-$. Moreover, we have $\mathfrak{C}P_+ = P_-\mathfrak{C}$.

Then $\mathfrak{H}_\psi$ is $\mathfrak{c}$-symmetric: $\mathfrak{H}^*_\psi : H^2_- \to H^2$ acts by the formula $\mathfrak{H}^*_\psi g = P_+\bar{\psi}g$, so

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{H}^*_\psi\mathfrak{c})(f) &= (\mathfrak{c}\mathfrak{H}^*_\psi)(\bar{\zeta}\bar{f}) = \mathfrak{c}(P_+\bar{\psi}\bar{\zeta}\bar{f}) = \mathfrak{C}P_+(\bar{\psi}\bar{\zeta}\bar{f})\\ &= P_-\mathfrak{C}(\bar{\psi}\bar{\zeta}\bar{f}) = P_-(\bar{\zeta}\psi\zeta f) = P_-(\psi f) = \mathfrak{H}_\psi f.\end{aligned}$$

We may apply Lemma 2.2 (i), which gives:

$$\|\mathfrak{H}_\psi\| = \sup_{\|f\|=1} |\langle \mathfrak{H}_\psi f, \mathfrak{c}f\rangle| = \sup_{\|f\|=1} |\langle P_-(\psi f), \bar{\zeta}\bar{f}\rangle|.$$

Since $\mathfrak{c}f = \bar{\zeta}\bar{f} \in H^2_-$, there is no need of P_- in the last scalar product, and therefore, by (3),

$$\|\mathfrak{H}_\psi\| = \sup_{\|f\|=1} |\langle \psi f, \bar{\zeta}\bar{f}\rangle| = \Gamma(\psi).$$

Since $\|\mathfrak{H}_\psi\| = \Lambda(\psi)$ by (4), the theorem is proved. □

Also, from the second part of Lemma 2.2 it follows that the existence of an extremal function (a function that realizes $\Gamma(\psi)$) is equivalent to the fact that the Hankel operator attains its norm. This happens, for instance, if $\mathfrak{H}_\psi$ is compact, which is equivalent, via Hartman's theorem [6], to $\psi \in H^\infty + C(\mathbb{T})$, where $C(\mathbb{T})$ denotes the algebra of continuous functions on $\mathbb{T}$.

Note that in [4] the solution to the extremal problem is related to truncated Toeplitz operators. These are operators on $K_\Theta = H^2 \ominus \Theta H^2$ defined, for $\phi \in H^\infty$, by the formula

$$A^\Theta_\phi(f) = P_\Theta \phi f, \quad f \in K_\Theta,$$

where P_Θ is the orthogonal projection onto K_Θ. More precisely, it is shown in [4] that, if there is an inner function Θ such that $\psi\Theta \in H^\infty$, then

$$\Lambda(\psi) = \Gamma(\psi) = \|A^\Theta_{\psi\Theta}\|.$$

The relation with Theorem 3.1 above is made by the following observation. Consider the orthogonal decompositions $H^2 = K_\Theta \oplus \Theta H^2$ and $H^2_- = \bar{\Theta} K_\Theta \oplus \bar{\Theta} H^2_-$. With respect to them, the only nonzero entry of the matrix of $\mathfrak{H}_\psi$ is in the upper left corner, and it is equal to $A_{\psi\Theta} : K_\Theta \to K_\Theta$ followed by multiplication with $\bar{\Theta}$. Consequently, in this case most of the results for the Hankel operators can be translated in terms of the truncated Toeplitz operator. Moreover, this is an *analytic* truncated Toeplitz operator, that is, one whose symbol is in H^∞. Their theory is significantly simpler that in the case of general truncated Toeplitz operators, since we may apply Sarason's interpolation arguments.

4 Final remarks

This section has no claim of novelty; its purpose is to put some other results in [4] in a more general context.

4.1 First, note that it is immediate that $\Gamma(\psi) \leq \|\psi\|_\infty$. Obviously $\Gamma(\psi)$ depends only on the antianalytic part of ψ. Using the equivalence of (1) and (2), and Nehari's theorem [8], it follows that for each $\psi \in L^\infty$ there exists $\hat{\psi}$ such that $\psi - \hat{\psi} \in H^\infty$ and $\|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty = \Gamma(\psi)$. In the context of truncated Toeplitz operators used in [4], $\hat{\psi}$ corresponds to what is called therein a *norm attaining symbol*.

4.2 In case an extremal function exists (equivalently, when the Hankel operator attains its norm) one can say more. With the previous notations, suppose $g \in H^2$ is an extremal function with $\|g\|_2 = 1$; thus $\|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}} g\|_2 = \|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}}\|$. The sequence of inequalities

$$\|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty = \|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}}\| = \|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}} g\|_2 = \|P_-(\hat{\psi} g)\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\psi} g\|_2 \leq \|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty \|g\|_2 = \|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty$$

imply that $\|P_-(\hat{\psi} g)\|_2 = \|\hat{\psi} g\|_2 = \|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty$. It follows then, first that $\hat{\psi}$ has constant modulus, and secondly that $\hat{\psi} g \in H^2_-$ and thus $\hat{\psi} g_o \in H^2_-$, where g_o is the outer part of g. Then $\|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}} g_o\|_2 = \|\hat{\psi} g_o\|_2 = \|\hat{\psi}\|_\infty = \|\mathfrak{H}_{\hat{\psi}}\|$. Therefore, in case an extremal function exists, one can chose it outer, and thus not having zeros in $\mathbb{D}$. This recaptures the result of [7] quoted in [4], which says that if the symbol is continuous then there exists an extremal function which is nonzero on $\mathbb{D}$ (as noted above, a Hankel operator with continuous symbol is compact and thus attains its norm).

4.3 In case there exists an inner function Θ such that $\phi = \hat{\psi}\Theta \in H^\infty$, then the result can be strengthened. With the above notations, we have then $\bar{\Theta}\phi g_o \in H^2_-$, which implies $\phi g_o \in K_\Theta$; thus ϕ is a scalar multiple of the inner part of a function in K_Θ. This is essentially noticed in the remarks after [4, Theorem 2].

4.4 Finally, let us note that, in case there exists no extremal function, norm attaining symbols might not have constant modulus. An example appears in [5, Ch. IV, Example 4.2]. Namely, suppose Θ is an inner function that does not extend analytically across the unit circle in the neighborhood of 1, while f is a nonconstant invertible outer function with $\|f\|_\infty = 1$ that has modulus 1 on an arc of $\mathbb{T}$ around 1. Then the only norm attaining symbol for the Hankel operator $\mathfrak{H}_{\bar{\Theta} f}$ is $\bar{\Theta} f$, which has not constant modulus.

References

[1] Garcia, S. R.: Approximate antilinear eigenvalue problems and related inequalities. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **136** (2008), no. 1, 171–179.

[2] Garcia, S. R.; Putinar, M.: Complex symmetric operators and applications. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **358** (2006), 1285–1315.

[3] Garcia, S. R.; Putinar, M.: Complex symmetric operators and applications. II. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.* **359** (2007), no. 8, 3913–3931.

[4] Garcia, S. R.; Ross, W. T.: A nonlinear extremal problem on the Hardy space, *Computational Methods and Function Theory*, **9** (2009), no. 2, 485–524.

[5] Garnett, J. B. *Bounded analytic functions* Pure and Applied mathematics, vol. 96, Academic Press, Inc., New-York-London, 1981.

[6] Hartman, P.: On completely continuous Hankel matrices, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **9** (1958), 862–866.

[7] Khavinson, S.Ja.: Two papers on extremal problems in complex analysis, *Amer. Math. Soc. Transl.* **129** (1986), no.2.

[8] Nehari, Z.: On bounded bilinear forms, *Ann. of Math.*, **65** (1957), 153–162.

[9] Peller, V.V.: *Hankel Operators and Their Applications*, Springer, 2003.